

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ture," &c., in the same wide sense, as distinguished from merely secular writings. Thus Pope Nicholas I. speaks of "the divinely-inspired opinions of the Fathers": Pope Innocent III. quotes a passage of Augustine as "sacred Scripture," which expression Melchior Canus tells us is to be understood in the same sense as when the Papal laws are called "sacred"—viz., in order that they may be distinguished from the laws of temporal princes: and Bellarmine says, that "although the canons of councils and the decrees of popes are distinguished from and inferior to divine Scripture, yet that, *in their own way* (suo modo), they are, and may be called, *sacred and canonical Scripture*, in order to distinguish them from the writings of profane authors and of the Church Fathers, which are not a rule."—De concil. auct., lib. ii., c. xii.

Having premised thus much respecting the usage which prevailed in ancient times relatively to the the terms "canonical," "Scripture," &c., we proceed to examine the documents above enumerated, and which are those whereon Roman Catholic divines found their defence of that part of the decree of the 4th session of the Council of Trent which concerns the Apocrypha. First, then, we take the famous passage of Augustine, in his treatise "*de Doctrina Christiana*" (lib. ii., cap. 8). Speaking of the study of writings connected with sacred subjects, which (in accordance with the usage above noticed) he calls by the generic name of "divine Scriptures" (*divinæ Scripturæ*), he recommends that particular attention should be bestowed on the Scriptures called *canonical*. He then proceeds—"The following method is, therefore, to be observed in reference to the *canonical* Scriptures; those which are received by all the Catholic Churches are to be *preferred* to those which some of the Churches do not yet acknowledge; and in the case of the latter class, again, those which are received by the more numerous and more important Churches are to be preferred to those which are received by the fewer and less important." Having laid down this general principle, he then gives a catalogue of all the *canonical* Scriptures ("*totus canon Scripturarum*"). In this catalogue he includes Tobit, Judith, two Books of Maccabees, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus.* This catalogue has been termed the Canon of Augustine, in contradistinction to the Canon of Jerome (from which the Apocryphal books are excluded); and is the Canon which the Council of Trent has ratified, declaring all the books, with all their parts, to be sacred and canonical. The advocates of the Council appeal to the authority of Augustine in justification of the canonization of the Apocrypha; but the slightest attention to Augustine's words shows that he uses the word "canonical" in a very different sense from that in which the Tridentine Fathers employ it. With them "canonical" means "inspired;" he uses the term in a much wider sense, as denoting the books which were held in reverence and read in the Churches, in which category, besides the inspired books, the apocryphal were also contained. And that the word, as employed by him, must be understood with this latitude of meaning is obvious, from what he says as to the *preferenee* to be given to some of the canonical books over others. In the case of *inspired* Scripture, it would be absurd to talk of preference. Inspiration does not admit of degrees. The divine element of the Scriptures is not a quantitative thing, conferring different values on different parts of the Scriptures, in proportion to the amount of it that may be found or thought to exist in them. The above is no new explanation of Augustine's words in the passage under consideration; it was given by one of the most renowned Roman doctors, and one, moreover, who was the personal antagonist of Luther, Cardinal Cajetan. We shall quote his own words, as they occur at the close of his Commentary on the Book of Esther. The whole passage is most remarkable, and, therefore, we will make no apology for giving it at length:—"Here we end our commentaries on the historical books of the Old Testament; for the remainder—viz., Judith, Tobit, and the Books of Maccabees—are not included by St. Jerome among the canonical books, but are placed, along with Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, among the Apocrypha. Do not be uneasy, tyro, if you should anywhere find those [apocryphal] books enumerated amongst the canonical, either by holy councils or by holy doctors; for the words both of councils and of doctors must be reduced to the judgment of Jerome; and, according to his decision, *those books* [the apocryphal books enumerated], and if there be any others like them in the canon of the Bible, are *not canonical*—that is to say, do not contain rules *for confirming articles of faith; they may, however, be called canonical, as containing rules for the edification* of the faithful, inasmuch as they have been admitted into the canon of the Bible and authorized for this very purpose. With *this distinction* you will be able to discern the meaning of the *words of Augustine* (de Doctr. Christ., lib. ii.), as, also, of the decrees of the Council of Florence, under Eugenius IV., and of the provincial Councils of Carthage and Laodicea, and of Popes Innocent and Gelasius."† These striking words were penned before the Council of Trent had uttered its anathema against all who should dare to deny the canonical authority (in the *fullest* sense of the word canonical) of the apocryphal books. We learn from them—First, that a Roman cardinal (who is described by his contemporaries as an "incomparable theologian," "to whom, as to a common oracle, men were wont to resort in all difficult questions of theology"), an avowed enemy of the Reformation, writing shortly before the Council of Trent, adopts Jerome's canon, and rejects the Apocrypha as authority in questions of *faith*, while he allows its value for the *edification* of the faithful; thus assigning to it exactly the same place as the Church of England does in her 6th Article. Secondly we learn that, in the passage of Augustine under consideration, as also in the other documents referred to by Cajetan, the word "canonical," when applied to the apocryphal books, is used in a wide sense, which must not be confounded with that which it bears when applied specially to the inspired books. Thirdly, we see from Cajetan's own usage, that, even in his day, the phrase "*Canon* of the Bible" (Canon Bibliæ) meant the whole list of books contained in the Vulgate, comprising the *non*-canonical as well as the strictly canonical Scriptures.

Bearing in mind, then, this usage of the word "canonical," we come to the palmary argument in support of the divine authority of the Apocrypha, derived from the decree of the Council of Carthage. We said we would consent to waive all the objections to the genuineness of this decree, weighty as they are, and admit its evidence in the case. Let us hear, then, what it is. In the 47th canon it is decreed, "that, with the exception of the *canonical* Scriptures, nothing should be read in the Church under the name of divine Scriptures" [*i.e.*, no forgeries or legendary tales pretending to be the compositions of inspired men]. Then a catalogue is given of the "canonical Scriptures" ("sunt autem canonicæ Scripturæ," &c.), which agrees exactly with that given by Augustine, except that in it the authorship of the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus is attributed to Solomon, which is a manifest error, and, of itself, invalidates the claim of the council, not only to be regarded as infallible (for this it can hardly claim, in any case, having been only a *provincial* synod), but even as competent to pronounce an opinion upon the subject. Without, however, insisting upon this, and allowing the decree all the weight that its advocates claim for it, our simple answer is, that the word "canonical" is used in the wide sense above explained—the sense in which Augustine, who is said to have been present at the council, himself employed it—the sense, moreover, in which Cajetan expressly tells us we must understand it. Nay, more, the decree itself explains the sense in which the word "canonical" is used in it; for at the close thereof we read, that the council declared the aforesaid books to be canonical, "because they received them from their ancestors "*to be read in the Church*" ("in Ecclesia legenda"). And, lastly, that the African Church of the fourth century never intended to place the Apocrypha on a par with the inspired Scriptures—to *canonize* it, in the modern sense of the term—is clear from the explicit testimony of the two African bishops, Junilius and Primasius, who wrote about a century and a half later (the middle of the 6th century). Junilius expressly excludes from the canonical Scriptures (strictly so called) the books of Judith, Wisdom, and Maccabees; and, for this reason, because the Hebrews and Jerome excluded them—a reason, which, of course, excludes the rest of the Apocrypha also. And Primasius, commenting on the 4th chapter of the Apocalypse, says, that St John, in mentioning the twenty-four wings and twenty-four elders, alludes to the number of the books of the old Testament, "which number," he adds, "*we have received* as possessed of *canonical authority*."* Surely, the African Church of the 6th century, speaking through two of its most eminent bishops, may be allowed to be a better expositor of the sense intended to be assigned to the word "canonical" by their great bishop, Augustine, and a council at which he assisted, only a century and a half before, than a few Italian bishops of the 16th century, who, as we shall hereafter see, were very far from being unanimous respecting the conclusion which was, at last, arrived at.

In our next number we hope to resume this subject, and complete our examination of the proofs usually urged in support of the Tridentine decree respecting the Apocrypha.

* Augustine does not expressly mention the Book of Baruch or the apocryphal parts of Daniel and Esther, but it may be assumed that he intended to include them; because the African Bible was a translation from the LXX., in which they form constituent parts of Jeremiah, Daniel, and Esther, respectively.

† Hoc in loco terminamus Commentaria Librorum Histor. Vet. Test. Nam reliqui—viz., Judith, Tobiæ, et Maccabæorum, libri a B. Hieronymo *extra canonices libros* supputantur, et inter *Apocrypha* locantur, cum libro Sapientiæ et Ecclesiastico. Nec turberis, novitie si alicubi repereris libros istos inter *canonicos* supputari, vel in sacris conciliis, vel in sacris doctoribus. Nam ad Hieronymi limam reducenda sunt tam verba conciliorum, quam doctorum; et juxta illius sententiam, libri isti, et si qui alii sunt in *Canone Bibliæ* similes, *non sunt canonici* hoc est non sunt *regulares* ad firmandum ea quæ sunt *fidei*; possunt tamen dici canonici, hoc est regulares ad ædificationem fidelium, utpote in Canone Bibliæ ad hoc recepti et authoritati. Cum hac enim distinctione discernere poteris et *dicta Augustini* in lib. 2, de Doctr. Christ., et Scripta in Conc. Flor., sub Eugen. IV., Script.que in provincialibus Conciliis Carthag. et Laodic, et ab Innocentio ac Gelasio Pontificibus. Cajetan. in omnes authenticos Vet. Test. hist. libr., Comment. p. 482. Parisiis, 1546.

* The Christian Fathers generally, and, amongst them, Jerome, not unfrequently arranged the Old Testament Books as received by the Jews (and, consequently, exclusive of the Apocrypha), so as to correspond in number to the letters of the Greek alphabet (24), just as the Jews made 22 books, in conformity with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

Correspondence.

THE TWO VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have been induced by your paper to compare some chapters of the Douay and English versions of the Holy Scriptures together, and am struck with their substantial agreement.* I wish, however, to know which translation (for they are both, of course, only translations) is really correct in the following passages. The Prophecy of Isaias, ch. i., v. 18, Douay Bible, has—"Come and accuse me, saith the Lord." The English Bible translates the same words—"Come now, and let us *reason* together, saith the Lord."

I cannot but think this appeal to reason savours strongly of Protestantism, though I confess I cannot well make sense of the Douay translation; for why should "learning to do well, relieving the oppressed, or defending the fatherless and the widow," lead any one to *accuse* God; or why should *accusing* God make sins that are as red as scarlet, white as snow. The expression, to say the best of it, is not a happy or very intelligible one, though I doubt if your English version be a bit more so; for what has *reason* to do with the forgiving of sins, any more than *accusing* God could lead to such forgiveness.

I dare say I am only displaying my own ignorance by these remarks; but not pretending to be a learned scholar myself, I am really anxious to know from those who are learned in said matters, what they have to say on the subject. As to asking a (Roman) Catholic priest for such information, I have long since given that up as useless, or worse; for I should at once be marked as a heretic if I did so.

When my hand is in, I may as well ask you about another passage—Isaias, ch. ii.; after speaking, in the 18th and 19th verses, of the total destruction of idols, and man going into the holes of the rocks and caves of the earth from the face of the fear of the Lord, and the glory of His Majesty when he shall rise up to strike (or shake terribly) the earth, proceeds, according to the Douay Bible, in v. 20, thus—"In that day a man shall cast away his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which he made for himself to adore, moles and bats." Your authorized version has it—"In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver and gold which they made to worship, *to the* moles and *to the* bats." This may appear to be a trifling difference, but there must be some reason for it; both cannot be right. Can you tell me whether idols of silver and gold were ever made by any one in the shape of moles and bats. Did any nation ever worship moles and bats, or, rather, silver and gold images of them? I am sincerely anxious to come at the truth, and especially with reference to the note of the Douay version on v. 18 of that chapter—Your obedient servant,

AN INQUIRER.

The two questions put by our correspondent can be shortly answered. On the first point—namely, whether the translation of Isaiah i. 18, given in the Douay Bible, or the English authorized version, is the correct one, we have no hesitation in giving a preference to the latter, for the following reasons:—The particular form of the Hebrew verb† which the Douay Bible translates "accuse," and the authorized version "reason," unquestionably means, "to argue a point, reason." Thus, for example, Gesenius, the best modern Hebrew authority, states as the meaning, "disputavit cum aliquo," to dispute with any one. The LXX version of this word, in the passage before us, is διελεγχθωμεν, and the Syriac version reads ܢܬܬܟܚ, both of which give the same interpretation as the authorized English translation. It may be added, that this form of the verb *never* has in Hebrew the active meaning "to accuse." Our Roman Catholic readers can satisfy themselves on this point by referring to the only other passages where it occurs—viz., Gen. xx. 16, and Job. xxiii. 7. Our correspondent appears to have found some difficulty in perceiving what *reason* has to do with the forgiveness of sins; but a moment's consideration of the entire passage will, we think, remove this objection. The verse contains an invitation *to discuss* the question whether God was willing or unwilling to show mercy, implying that reason, as well as justice, was on his side, and asserting his power and his willingness to pardon the most aggravated sins. The implied conclusion of the *reasoning* is, that God's willingness to pardon the Jews threw the blame of their destruction on themselves. The fulness and freeness of this offer of pardon arose from the fact, that God had himself provided a way, whereby, in the fulness of time, a full and sufficient atonement would be made for the sins of the whole world; a way whereby all mankind might "be justified *freely* by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."—Rom. iii. 24.

The second question of our correspondent, with reference to the "moles and bats," may be disposed of more briefly. Here the Douay version appears plainly wrong; for the preposition "*to*" (in Hebrew ל), occurs before *both* the words moles and bats in the original. The Vulgate version (which the Douay translator, as usual, has ser-

* Both versions, for instance, of Isaias i. 13 are literally the same—"Incense is an abomination to me."

† נכחה

vilely followed) appears to have concluded the sense of the passage to be, that the idolaters were either to worship images as blind as moles and bats, or to worship moles and bats themselves (*ut adoraret talpas et vespertiliones*). But the context obviously relates, not to the moral deterioration of idolaters, but to their terror and despair. It is absurd, however, to infer, as the note in the Douay version does, that because men on their first conversion to Christianity threw away their idols of silver and gold, that such a form of idolatry was *never afterwards* to arise in the bosom of the Christian Church. The Douay writer might with as much reason infer, that because the early Christians, as we are told in the Acts, had "all things common," therefore, all distinctions of property are henceforth to cease in the world.

We shall be very glad to hear again from our correspondent, with respect to any further differences he may discover between the authorized and Douay versions.

THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have thought that the following testimony from an enemy, to the excellence of our English translation of the Bible may interest some of your readers. It is taken from Faber's "Essay on the Characteristics of the Lives of the Saints," p. 116:—

"Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on in the ear like a music that never can be forgotten—like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness—nay, it is worshipped with a positive idolatry, in extenuation of whose grotesque fanaticism its intrinsic beauty pleads availingly with the man of letters and the scholar. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments; and all that there has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him for ever out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing which doubt never dimmed, and controversy never soiled. It has been to him all along as the silent, but, oh, how intelligible voice of his guardian angel; and in the length and breadth of the land, there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in his Saxon Bible. S. M. N.

ON CHARITY TO PROTESTANTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—I crossed the mountain to Jerry Donovan's, the other evening, to hear something more out of the paper about Father John. I found Jerry, and the wife, and childer sitting down to supper, and, of course, I took a seat; but 'twasn't like the supper in the old times, when we had the praties, enough and to spare; and, says Jerry, "I wonder will them good old times ever come back to us again." "Please God they will," says I; "sure the praties looks beautiful this blessed minute." "True for you," says he, "and glory be to God for that same; sure 'twas he sent the blight, and 'tis he can take it off again if he pleases; and," says he, "Dan, I'm thinking we never feel our blessings till they're taken from us; but then we see how good God has been to us all along, and we never giving him a bit of thanks for it." Well, sir, when the childer finished their supper, Nelly took the creatures off to bed, and I asked Jerry to get the paper about Father John, and read the rest of it. "Where did I leave off?" says he. "You were just beginning," says I, "with Father John's reason for not arguing with the minister." "Here's the place," says he. "The minister turned to Father John, 'and,' says he 'either you or I must be wrong, and 'twould be well to find out which of us is wrong; for we can't *both* be right.' 'That's true, anyhow,' says Father John; 'but 'tis easy known which of us is wrong; for,' says he, 'every heretic must be wrong, and you're a heretic; therefore, you must be wrong.' 'Well,' says the minister, 'I think I could pick a hole in your logic if I wished; but,' says he 'even granting, for argument sake, that we Protestants are heretics, isn't it your duty to reason with us, and set us right?' 'Sure 'tisn't with heretics I'd be arguing,' says Father John. 'Why,' says the minister, 'the worse heretics we are, the more you ought to try to convert us; don't you care at all,' says he, 'for our poor souls? and, if we're wrong, would'nt it be a charity to try to set us right?' 'Well,' says Father John, 'I do care for your souls, and I pray that you may all be brought into the true Church before you die.' 'But,' says the minister, 'tisn't enough to pray for us; you should give us lectures, and put up notices, saying, that on such an evening you'd prove the Protestant religion to be wrong; and you should invite us all to come to hear you; and,' says he, 'if you did *that*, I'd believe that you felt some care for us; and,' says he, 'I'd go to hear you myself; for,' says he, 'all I want is to get at the truth; and,' says he, 'nothing brings out the truth like a good discussion; and' says he, 'if we're wrong, 'tisn't intentionally; 'tisn't our fault, but our misfortune.'" "That's fair, Jerry," says I; "nothing could be fairer; and it reminds me of what Bill Flaherty, the jockey, once said to poor old Father Ned of Kilbarry. Bill sold him a horse, that he swore hadn't a fault in the world; but, he wasn't three days bought when 'twas found that he was blind of an eye, and had the spavin. So Father Ned sends for Bill, and, says he, 'you deceiving villian, is that the horse that you told me had'nt a fault in the world, and he only fit for the crows.' 'Arra, your Reverence,' says Bill, 'don't be slandering the poor beast, sure that isn't his *fault*, but his *misfortune*;' and, in like manner, we shouldn't be running down the Protestants because they hadn't the luck to be born Catholics like ourselves; but we should do our best to convert them; *and 'tis often* my heart bleeds for the poor creatures when I think of their miserable state; sure 'twould be the greatest charity for our clergy to try to set them right." "True for you," says Jerry; "and 'twas last Sunday in chapel I was thinking that same, when Father John was telling us of the elegant mission the priests are sending out to convert the black niggers in foreign parts; sure we've poor niggers of Protestants here at home who are as ignorant as any heathen; they never say a prayer to the Blessed Virgin, nor a Rosary, nor even a 'Hail Mary;' they never ask the intercession of a saint, nor care for holy water, nor even as much as cross themselves, and all for want of our priests teaching them the differ, and proving to them that we're right. But to go on with the paper—the parson told Father John, 'that 'twasn't enough to pray for Protestants; but that the surest way to set them right, if they were wrong, would be to reason with them.' 'But' says Father John, 'I've many things of my own to look after, that are of more importance than attending to Protestants.'* 'Well,' says the minister, 'that surprises me; you think that we're all going astray, and that our souls will be lost: don't you?' 'To be sure I do,' says he, '*only 'tisn't think it* I do, but *know it*.' '*Why then*, if that's the case,' says the minister, 'how could any business be more important than trying to save us? and,' says he, 'if you really believe what you say, you ought to preach to us, and try to set us right.' 'Sure we do preach to you,' says Father John, '*by our example*.'* 'Oh,' says the minister, 'the Apostle Peter wasn't content with setting a good example to the people in his time; but he reasoned with them, and proved that his religion was the right one; and why don't you follow his example?'" "Why, Jerry," says I, "that's the very way Father John told us they converted the niggers; he said they reasoned with them, and proved that the heathen religion was wrong, and that the Holy Roman religion was right; and sure 'twould be as easy to prove this for the Protestants as for the niggers." "Anyhow," says Jerry, "they ought to try it; for charity should begin at home, though it shouldn't end there. But to go on with the story; the parson stuck to Father John, and hunted the poor man from one excuse to another, till he was almost beat out; but when Humphrey Carey saw him so hard pushed, he came to his help, and, says he, 'I'll tell you the reason why the priests of the Holy Catholic Church don't enter into discussions with heretics, because,' says he, 'the word of God forbids it.'† 'What part of it?' says the minister. 'The verse in Corinthians' says he, 'where St. Paul *forbids us to be contentious*.'‡ "Well, Jerry," says I, "Humphrey is a real clever fellow; that was chapter and verse for the parson; sure 'tis well I knew the priests must have some good reason for never meeting the Protestant ministers in discussion; and sure they couldn't have a better reason than St. Paul being against it; but I suppose Father John was glad of the help." "'Tis he that was," says Jerry; "he looked, for all the world, like a man just let off the tread-mill, smiling with delight, but very tired; and, says he to the parson, 'I hope you'll take St. Paul's word, if you won't take mine!' Well, the minister began to laugh, and says he, 'that text won't save your bacon.' 'Why so?' says Father John. 'Because,' says the parson, 'St. Paul was a regular controversialist;' and, says he, 'if you read your Douay Bible as often as you read your Breviary, you'd know that St. Paul was one of the greatest disputers ever lived;‡ and, moreover, says he, 'that text has nothing at all to say to religious discussion.' 'Arra what else?' says Father John. 'Why,' says he, 'it merely refers to whether women should have their heads covered in church, or not.'" "Oh, murder, Jerry," says I, "that was a pity. Sure I thought Father John was all right when I heard the text." "But," says Jerry, "the worst of all was, the Protestants began to laugh, and Father John began to lose his temper; and, when the minister asked for some other reason why he wouldn't enter into discussion, he got fairly vexed; and, says he, 'the truth is, *when we see people determined on going to old Nick, we think it as well to let them alone*.'"§ "Oh, murder, Jerry," says I, "did Father John really say that?" "'Deed he did," says Jerry, "and 'twas a hard word for a Christian and a priest to use to poor creatures that don't know the differ; sure Father John is always talking to us about charity, but I don't think there was much charity in that; and," says he, "I seen a thing in Cork that might be a pattern to Father John, in the way of charity." "What was it?" says I. "Why," says he, "I was standing near Patrick's Bridge, watching the steamers, and, among the crowd, I saw a great, fierce-looking sailor, with a squint in one eye that would look round a corner, and a big cut across his face, and as much curled hair under his chin as would stuff a bed; and while I was looking at him, a poor creature fell into the sea, and, as he couldn't swim, he was sinking fast. We all began to screech and bawl, but never a one of us did anything to help the poor man; but the big sailor whips off his jacket, and jumps into the sea, and brings the poor fellow out by the hair of the head. Well, the boys gave a cheer for him that would rise the cockles of your heart, and a grand-looking gentleman began to praise him for what he had done; but, says he, 'sir, I only did my duty; and, moreover,' says he, 'sure the poor fellow was a countryman of my own, and even if he was my worst enemy I'd have done the same.' Well, the crowd gave another cheer that almost lifted the roofs off the houses. And I'm thinking, Dan, that same big sailor might be a pattern to our priests in the way of charity. There's the poor Protestants drowning, according to their account—drowning, body and soul—and still they won't say a word to hinder them from going down to hell." "Oh, Jerry, says I, "that's a hard word of yours; I don't think myself that every Protestant will go to hell; there are some very honest, decent people among them." "Well," says Jerry, "*if it's a hard word, it isn't mine; for*" says he, "don't you remember the words of the book that we were taught out of, and that the priests teach our childer out of, and where we're told that no person can be saved who does not belong to our Church; that out of the Church there is no salvation; and that no Jew, Turk, heretic, or schismatic belongs to that Church.* Sure that's only a civil way of saying that every Protestant must go to hell, or to Old Nick, as Father John said; and" says he, "there's nothing makes me so doubtful of the truth of the priests' religion, as seeing that, with all their talk about charity, they never try to convert Protestants." "But, Jerry," says I, "what do poor ignorant boys like us know about such things? You may be sure our priests have wise reasons for not arguing with the Protestants." "True for you," says he, "and 'tis what I'm thinking myself this long time; but 'tisn't any of the reasons Father John gave." "What other?" says I. "By my word, then," says he, "I think the truth is, that our priests are *afraid* to argue with the ministers; I'm thinking that's the *true* reason." "Jerry," says I, "I'm ashamed of you; Jerry," says I, "you're a disgrace to the woman that owns you; Jerry," *says* I, "*arn't you afraid the roof would fall on* you for speaking such blasphemy of your clergy?" "Why," says he, "I can't think of any other reason; but if you know of any other, let us hear it." Well, Mr. Editor, as I hadn't an answer ready, I turned again on Jerry, and, says I, "why should our priests be afraid to meet the Protestant clergy; sure they know the Latin and Greek as well as any of them." "I don't deny it," says he; "but 'tisn't Latin and Greek would do for them in an argument with the ministers; 'tis out of the Bible they should argue, and 'tis myself thinks our priests don't know much about *that book*, whatever they may about the Latin and Greek." Well, sir, on this I was so vexed with Jerry, that I got up and left the house; but as I went along, I began to think over the matter, and I tried hard to find a good reason for our priests never meeting the Protestant clergy; but the more I tried, the more I couldn't find one. It seemed to me that even if our priests didn't care for *winning a victory* over the Protestants, still for *charity's sake* they ought to reason with them; for, surely, if our religion is the right one, the priests ought to be able to *prove it;* and then the Protestants would come over to the true Church, and their poor souls would be saved. Still, I know there must be some good reason for our priests not doing so; and if your honour knows it, maybe you'd tell it to me, and set my mind at rest.

Your humble servant to command,

DAN. CARTHY.

* Fact

† 1 Cor. xi. 16, Douay Bible.

‡ See Acts xvii., 17; Acts xviii., 19; Acts xix., 8, 9; Acts xv., 2—Douay Bible.

§ Should any Roman Catholic doubt that the priest used these words, the Editor is willing to give him Mr. Carthy's address, who will satisfy him on this point.

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I fear the dreary, monotonous repetition of extracts from the Fathers cannot long be agreeable to the taste of the generality of your readers; but your reply to my letter, in CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. iv., p. 34, col. 1, renders it necessary to cite again a passage from St. Cyril, given under the above reference.

You decry the argument which this holy patriarch uses to illustrate the nature of prayers and sacrifice for the relief of the dead as *very poor*, and not to the taste of some Roman Catholics.

To highly-intellectual minds, trained to abstruse metaphysical disquisitions, and profound theological deductions,

*Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine, by way of Question and Answer. Dublin: Printed by C. M. Warren, Wholesale Catholic Bookseller, 21, Upper Ormond-quay, 1850, pp. 17 and 18.